

Appendix B: Capacity Evaluation Scoring Rubric

1. Governance:

	Scoring Criteria
Mission Statement	<p>3 – High- Clear expression of organization's reason for existence which describes an enduring reality that reflects its values and purpose; broadly held within organization and frequently referred to</p> <p>2- Moderate - Some expression of organization's reason for existence that reflects its values and purpose, but may lack clarity; held by only a few, lacks broad agreement or rarely referred to</p> <p>1 – Low - No written mission or limited expression of the organization's reason for existence; lacks clarity or specificity; either held by very few in organization or rarely referred toⁱ</p>
Vision Statement	<p>3 – High- Vision translated into clear, bold set of (up to three) goals that organization aims to achieve, well-defined time frames for attaining goals; goals are broadly known within organization and consistently used to direct actions and set priorities</p> <p>2- Moderate – Vision translated into a concrete set of goals; goals lack at least two of following four attributes: clarity, boldness, associated metrics, or time frame for measuring attainment; goals known by only a few, or only occasionally used to direct actions or set priorities</p> <p>1 – Low - No written vision statement</p>
Board of Directors	
• Appropriate Number	<p>3 – High - Yes</p> <p>1 – Low - No</p>
• Average Rate	<p>3 – High – Have maintained appropriate number for 3 years</p> <p>1 – Low – Have not maintained appropriate number for 3 years</p>
• Terms and term limits	<p>3 – High – Yes</p> <p>1 – Low – No</p>
• Reflective of demographic served	<p>3 – High – Yes (determined by appropriate means)</p> <p>2 – Moderate – Yes (no appropriate way to determine)</p> <p>1 – Low – No</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Boards role in goal setting and communication 	<p>3 – High - Provide strong direction, support and accountability to programmatic leadership and engaged as a strategic resource; communication between board and leadership reflects mutual respect, appreciation for roles and responsibilities, shared commitment and valuing of collective wisdom</p> <p>2 – Moderate - Provide occasional direction, support and accountability to leadership; informed about all 'material' matters in a timely manner and responses/decisions actively solicited</p> <p>1 – Low - Provide little direction, support, and accountability to leadership; board not fully informed about 'material' and other major organizational matters; largely "feel-good" support</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Family/business relationships 	<p>3 – High - No</p> <p>1 – Low - Yes</p>
Policies and Practices	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conflict of interest 	<p>3 – High - Yes</p> <p>1 – Low - No</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whistleblower policy 	<p>3 – High - Yes</p> <p>1 – Low - No</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Business continuity plan 	<p>3 – High - Yes</p> <p>1 – Low - No</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents meetings and track actions 	<p>3 – High - Yes</p> <p>1 – Low - No</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ED hiring process (Review and approval by independent persons, comparability data, and verification of the deliberation and decision) 	<p>3 – High - Yes to all 3</p> <p>2 – Moderate – Yes to 2</p> <p>1 – Low – Yes to 1 or none</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lobby activities 	<p>3 – High – Reported on IRS 990 and policies in place</p> <p>2 – Moderate – Reported on IRS but no policies in place</p> <p>1 – Low – No to either</p> <p>N/A – Do not conduct lobbying activities</p>

2. Financial Management:

	Scoring Criteria
Policies, Practices, and Procedures	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written financial policies and procedures 	3 – High - Yes 1 – Low - No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accountability standards or practices and evaluate • And Controls to ensure accuracy 	3 – High -Very solid financial accountability standards. Financial controls continuously updated; budget integrated into full operations; as strategic tool, it develops from process that incorporates and reflects organizational needs and objectives; performance-to-budget closely and regularly monitored 2 – Moderate - Limited financial standards and controls; budget utilized as operational tool; used to guide/assess financial activities; performance-to-budget monitored periodically 1 – Low - No or very limited financial planning; general budget developed; performance against budget loosely or not monitored
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accrual basis accounting 	3 – High – Accrual accounting 1 – Low – Cash accounting
Oversight	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Day-to-day fiscal management 	Report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dedicated fiscal management 	3 – High - Yes 1 – Low - No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsible for Budget Development 	Report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treasurer and evaluate 	3 – High - Yes (Agency has an active treasurer) 2 – Moderate – Yes (Agency has a treasurer position, but individual is not very active in financial management and budgeting) 1 – Low – No (Treasurer position does not exist or is not filled.)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual review overseen by board 	3 – High - Yes 1 – Low - No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Form 990 to board 	3 – High - Yes 1 – Low – No

Insurance	
• Workers' compensation	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Business Auto Liability	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Commercial/General Liability	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Directors and Officers Liability	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No N/A – Not required
• Professional Liability	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No N/A – Not required
• Other types of insurance	Report

3. Human Resources:

	Scoring Criteria
Employment Policies and Practices	
• Written personnel policies	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Non-discrimination policy	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Affirmative Action Plan	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Reflective of demographic served	3 – High – Yes (determined by appropriate means) 2 – Moderate – Yes (no appropriate way to determine) 1 – Low – No
• Labor laws clearly posted	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Criminal background checks on employees	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Abuse and neglect checks	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• How often conducted?	Report
Staff Training and Development	
• New employee orientation	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Staff Development Plan	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Leadership Development Plan	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Succession Plan	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• License and certification	3 – High – Required and are licensed or certified, consistently adheres to requirements 2 – Moderate – Required and are licensed or certified, however inconsistent adherence to requirements

	1 – Low – Required but not licensed or certified N/A – Not required
Volunteers	
• Screened and trained	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Utilized	Report

4. Information Management:

	Scoring Criteria
Policies and Procedures	
• Retention and destruction schedule	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Funder requirements incorporated	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Records custodian	Report
Data Management	
• Client program and participation data	Report
• Volunteer applications and records	Report
• Personnel records	Report
• Financial records	Report
• Donor and contribution records	Report
• Mailing list	Report
• Workflow description	Report
• Inventory of hardware and software	Report
• Disaster readiness or recovery plan	Report
<i>Data Collection Score:</i>	3 – High – 75% or better 2 – Moderate – 50 – 74% 1 – Low – Less than 50%
• Access to program data	3 – High – Appropriate access 1 – Low – Inappropriate access

• Program data backed-up	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Validity and reliability	3 – High – The agency has systems in place to ensure the reliability and validity of data 2 – Moderate – The agency strives to ensure reliability and validity of data collected 1 – Low – The agency does not ensure reliability and validity of data collected
• Is data retained in accordance with policy	Report 3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
Confidentiality	
• Confidentiality policies and procedures	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Confidentiality agreement for: ○ Employees ○ Volunteers ○ Board members	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No 3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No 3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• How often renewed	Report
• Regular Trainings	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Individual passwords for each computer	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Privacy filters for monitors	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Back-up protocol for collected data	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Utilize paper shredders and/or secure recycling	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Other steps	Report
Systems and Infrastructure	
• Meet current and anticipated needs	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Challenges	Report
• Upgrades in next 2 years	Report

• Off-site data storage	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Data management software	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Network computer system	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Network administrator on staff	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Network back-up protocol	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Utilize the following: ○ Microsoft Office Suite ○ Commercial analytical software	Report Report
• Rate systems for:	
○ Data Collection	Report
○ Data Management	Report
○ Data Reporting	Report
○ Data Storage	Report

5. Service Delivery:

	Scoring Criteria
Program Services	
• Most successful	Report
• Barriers	Report
Infrastructure	
• Meet current and anticipated needs	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Rate capacity for <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Office building and meeting space ○ Parking ○ Storage 	Report Report Report
Policies, Practices, and Procedure	
• ADA Compliance and documentation	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Written non-discrimination in public accommodations	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Staffing ratios	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No N/A – Not required
• Feedback from participants	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
• Customer grievance process	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No

6. Performance Management:

	Scoring Criteria
Performance Management	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Barriers and challenges 	Report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilized to guide programming 	3- High (3 or more responses) 2- Moderate (2 responses) 1 – Low (0-1 responses) <u>Possible responses:</u> Clarity program purpose Focus staff on shared goals Improve service delivery Identify effective practices Enhance recordkeeping Communicate results to stakeholders Help agency compete for resources (Any other relevant)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent with other funders 	Report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communicated to board 	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communicated to staff and volunteers 	3 – High – Yes 1 – Low – No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rate systems for <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring performance Reporting performance Utilizing performance for evaluation and planning 	Report Report Report Report

7. Program-Based Budgeting:

	Scoring Criteria
Program-Based Budgeting	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procedures for developing and monitoring program budgets 	<p>3 – High - Agency has a well-designed and informed program budget development process. The program budget is utilized as the agency has determined. Performance measurement data is extensively utilized to design program budgeting. Program budgets are rigorously managed and adhered to.</p> <p>2 – Moderate - Agency has a limited system for utilizing information to develop the program budget. No performance data is used for the development of the program budget. Program budgets are managed and attempts are made to adhere to the program budget.</p> <p>1 – Low - Agency has no system for developing the program budget, no attempt is made to adhere to the program budget.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the process cover projected: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing revenues and expenditures Occasional or special revenues and expenditures Capital expenditures 	<p>3 – High – All three areas</p> <p>2 – Moderate – 2 areas</p> <p>1 – Low – 1 area</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual program budgets tied to annual operational plans? 	<p>3 – High – Yes</p> <p>1 – Low – No</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board members utilized in the process 	<p>3 – High – Yes</p> <p>1 – Low – No</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responsible for oversight 	Report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rate systems for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developing program budgets Assessing data to recognize trends Working with staff to understand budgets Working with board to understand Accurately forecasting change in the budget 	<p>Report</p> <p>Report</p> <p>Report</p> <p>Report</p>

8. External Relationships:

	Scoring Criteria
External Relationships	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration 	<p>3 – High - Built, leveraged, and maintained strong, high-impact, relationships with variety of relevant parties (local, state, and federal government entities as well as for-profit, other nonprofit, and community agencies); relationships deeply anchored in stable, long-term, mutually beneficial collaboration</p> <p>2 – Moderate - Early stages of building relationships and collaborating with other for-profit, nonprofit, or public sector entities</p> <p>1 – Low - Limited use of partnerships and alliances with public sector, nonprofit, or for profit entities</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Widely known and perceived to be engaged 	<p>3 – High – Yes</p> <p>1 – Low – No</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • External Partner Feedback <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Satisfaction ○ Effectiveness ○ Comments 	Report responses and comments from partners

ⁱ Some items have been modified from the McKinsey Capacity Assessment Grid, Venture Philanthropy Partners. www.venturephilanthropypartners.org